



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER 0772317274 FIILING DATE 08/12/88 FIRST NAMED INVENTOR OXFORD TONY LUCAS NO. A DK5815

BACON & THOMAS  
625 SLATERS LANE - 4TH FLOOR  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER  
FAN, J

APT UNIT 121 PAPER NUMBER 5

DATE MAILED: 06/12/89

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.  
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

This application has been examined  Responsive to communication filed on \_\_\_\_\_  This action is made final.  
*for 7 only*  
A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 0 month(s), 30 days from the date of this letter.  
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1.  Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-882. 2.  Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948.  
3.  Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. 4.  Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152.  
5.  Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. 6.  \_\_\_\_\_

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1.  Claims 1-75 are pending in the application.

Of the above, claims \_\_\_\_\_ are withdrawn from consideration.

2.  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ have been cancelled.

3.  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are allowed.

4.  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are rejected.

5.  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are objected to.

6.  Claims 1-75 are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7.  This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.

8.  Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9.  The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on \_\_\_\_\_. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are  acceptable.  not acceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948).

10.  The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ has (have) been  approved by the examiner.  disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11.  The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_, has been  approved.  disapproved (see explanation).

12.  Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has  been received  not been received  been filed in parent application, serial no. \_\_\_\_\_; filed on \_\_\_\_\_.

13.  Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14.  Other

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1 to 5, 11 to 17 and 21 to 25, drawn to indoles, classified in Class 546, subclass 201; class 514, subclass 323.

II. Claim 18, drawn to a group of intermediates, classified in Class 546, subclass 201.

III. Claim 19, drawn to another group of intermediates, classified in Class 546, subclass 201.

IV. Claim 20, drawn to another group of intermediates, classified in Class 546, subclass 201.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other, because of the following reasons:

Inventions I, II and III are related as species in an intermediate-final product relationship.

Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful other than to make the final product (MPEP 806.04(b), 3rd paragraph), and the species are patentably distinct. (MPEP 806.04(h)).

In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as pharmaceutical and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct since there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either

Serial No. 07/231274

-3-

Art Unit 121

instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 of the other invention.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed.

A telephone call was made to Mr. Fichter on June 7, 1989 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently-filed petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(h).

FAN:wdh

A/C 703 557-3920

6/9/89

Jane T. Fan  
JANE T. FAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 121